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Motion 6a:

That the Georgia Southern Faculty Senate asks the Board of Regents on the University System of Georgia to 1) add the words "sexual orientation" to the non-discrimination policy in Section 802.01 of the Policy Manual; and, 2) make available to the domestic partners of employees and students the same benefits and privileges that are provided to the spouses of employees and students.

Motion 6b:

That the Georgia Southern University Faculty Senate asks the President of the University to review all campus policies and benefit programs that include provisions for the spouses of faculty, staff, and students, and to take the necessary steps to amend such policies to provide equal treatment for the domestic partners of faculty, staff, and students.

That the Georgia Southern Faculty Senate asks the Board of Regents on the University System of Georgia to 1) add the words "sexual orientation" to the non-discrimination policy in Section 802.01 of the Policy Manual; and, 2) make available to the domestic partners of employees and students the same benefits and privileges that are provided to the spouses of employees and students.
Rationale:

Senate Response:

Motion 6a: This motion was moved and seconded. Dr. Shawn Forbes (COBA) objected to the wording of the rationale provided to the Senate in support of this motion. Dr. Schille suggested that since the rationale is not part of the motion, Dr. Forbes could assist in helping to make the rationale more acceptable. Dr. Forbes then asked if Dr. Grube or Dr. Vandegrift had a position on the motion. Dr. Grube responded that he was concerned that the Senate was approving motions that had not been referred to a committee for study. He pointed out that, for example,

Georgia Southern does not have any local benefits programs that could be addressed by the first motion and that the ramifications of the second motion reach beyond the Board of Regents to the General Assembly.

Dr. Forbes then asked why the motions had not been referred to the Faculty Welfare Committee. Dr. Schille responded that the SEC had determined that it was appropriate to bring these motions directly to the floor of the Senate. Dr. Forbes suggested that the motion be referred to the Faculty Welfare Committee.

Dr. John Brown (COBA) moved that the motion on the floor be amended to refer it to the Faculty Welfare Committee. This motion was seconded, and after some discussion about Roberts Rules of Order, approved.

After a further discussion of Roberts Rules of Order, Dr. Forbes moved that we rescind the previous vote (on motion 6b) and refer it to the Faculty Welfare Committee as well. This motion was seconded and after a show of hands, approved (21 to 6).

Dr. Clara Krug asked if it were important that the motion coming from the Faculty Welfare Committee be something that the Board of Regents be able to act upon or if it were important to make a statement similar to that of the other large universities in the state, as an indication of how these large institutions feel.

Motion 6b was moved, seconded, and approved with no discussion. [Note: The motion was later rescinded. See discussion.]